

Minutes of a Regular Meeting

Approved 5/13/04

Town of Los Altos Hills PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, April 8, 2004, 7:00 p.m.
Council Chambers, 26379 Fremont Road
cc: Cassettes (2) #6-04

1. ROLL CALL AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Planning Commission regular meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at Town Hall.

Present: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Mordo, Vitu, Cottrell & Kerns

Staff: Carl Cahill, Planning Director; Debbie Pedro, Associate Planner; Jimmy Forbis, Parks and Recreation Supervisor; Lani Smith, Planning Secretary

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED BY CONSENSUS: Motion by Commissioner Cottrell, seconded by Commissioner Mordo and passed by consensus to limit remarks to three minutes.

2. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE FLOOR-none

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 3.1 LANDS OF KERNS, 11888 Francemont Drive (225-03-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for landscape screening (north side only) and a lighting plan (continued from the February 12th Planning Commission meeting). (staff-Carl Cahill)

Commissioner Kerns, as the applicant, stepped down from the hearing.

The Planning Director introduced this item by reviewing the staff report regarding landscape screening on the north side only (west of the bay tree) and outdoor lighting.

Discussion ensued regarding the 2 to 3 year potential growth of the landscaping which will do much to break up the mass of the structure. Staff had requested that the additional trees be installed by May 1st. The applicant has requested a six month extension which would be effective from the day they move in late March, to September, 2004. They have submitted an arborist report as well as a letter from the tree nursery which recommends that the trees be planted in the fall rather than this time of year. Regarding the lights on the south side, they are not shielded but they do have opaque lenses which are normally allowed.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Bill Maston, project architect, clarified that sheet 1.9 refers to the lighting. He continued by addressing issues raised at the previous meeting. They have moved most of the lighting that was identified as objectionable, bringing them down one foot above grade. The lights on the south side are minimal. Regarding landscaping, they reviewed the different views and basically determined that in order to place the trees as shown on the plan, they have actually extended the landscape retaining wall below the walkway so there would be a convenient place for plantings. There are some underground utilities going in which they have to work around (indicated on the plan). They also built a new rock retaining wall about 8-10 feet below the foundation of the existing house. They rose all the soil levels in those areas so they could get immediate effect from the new planting being proposed. Since it was not recommended to put trees right up against the house they chose to put in native plants with a growth rate of a 20 foot height in a short period of time. The 5 gallon shrubs will add approximately 7 feet to the visual height. He further discussed the request to extend the planting time by 6 months (late September) primarily due to dealing with native plants and oaks.

Marc Ferrari, 12100 Old Snakey Road, provided pictures showing the story poles of the proposed oak trees. He reiterated information indicated in his e-mail addressed to Carl Cahill, stating from the direction of his property on Old Snakey Road, the Kern's proposed plantings do nothing to address the appearance of a two story façade (multi-purpose/rec room/walkout basement windows with deck and main floor above). He asked that consideration be given to increasing the number of oaks planted in the north facing ridgeline landscape plan. Screening of the two story elevation with additional oaks or bay-laurels (especially the rec room windows) should be given high priority.

Bernard Ferrari, 25800 Altamont Road, stated he did not expect to see this much of the house, asking for mitigation to minimize the impact.

Peter Nieh, 25765 Bassett Lane, asked for a clarification of the step lights which was provided by Bill Maston.

Bill Kerns, applicant, discussed the location of the story poles. The plans indicate many utility trenches, a sewer line going through there and some conducts. They are planning to put lower shrubs that will grow up and fill in the area of the rec room which do not have as extensive of a root system which may interfere with the sewer lines and the conducts.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Mordo voiced no major issues. The applicants could work with Mr. Ferrari to add a few more shrubs, however the plan is acceptable as submitted. He agreed with the requested extension of time for the installation of the trees. Commissioner Vitu agreed. She felt the concerns voiced by Mr. Ferrari were addressed by the proposed 15 gallon shrubs. She felt there was no problem extending the time for the installation of the trees. Commissioner Cottrell also agreed with the proposed exterior lighting plan, landscape screening plan and the request for an extension of time for installing the trees to September 23, 2004. Chairman Clow concurred.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Mordo and seconded by Commissioner Vitu to approve the request for a Site Development Permit for the exterior lighting and landscape screening plan for the north side of the home, subject to the conditions of approval, Lands of Kerns, 11888 Francemont Drive, with a change to condition #1, "the 24" rootball oak trees shall not be less than 10' high and 6' wide and shall be installed not later than **September 23, 2004.**"

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Mordo, Vitu & Cottrell
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Commissioner Kerns

This approval is subject to a 23 day appeal period..

- 3.2 LANDS OF LOS ALTOS HILLS, 27500 Purissima Road (58-04-CUP); A request for a Conditional Use Permit for recreational facilities at the Town's athletic fields and riding ring on Purissima Road; and installation of a public address system and street side parking along Purissima Road during large events. (staff-Jimmy Forbis-Debbie Pedro)

The Planning Director introduced Jimmy Forbis, Parks and Recreation Supervisor, indicating in previous years, the facility has been operated without a Conditional Use Permit, therefore, requests for exceptions to the Zoning Code were submitted for City Council review and approval on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Forbis referred to two areas which are annually requested by users: the use of a public address system; and the cessation of parking enforcement along Purissima Road. Condition #5 allows the use of amplified system up to five occurrences a year. This condition has been consistently applied to similar use permit requests such as Pinewood School and Westwind Barn. The overflow parking had previously been allowed only on Purissima Road. Staff recommends that this exception be included in the Conditional Use Permit and remain in effect during Little League games and tournaments and during designated Town events (i.e. Town picnic). The Conditional Use Permit would allow an annual review of the approved conditions and also give the neighbors an opportunity to address their concerns on an annual basis.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Hesterman, 12715 Canario Way, neighbor directly across from the filed, felt he could live with a portable PA system with events no more than five a year as his only concern was with noise.

Jim Abraham, 12831 Viscaino Road, voiced concern over the riding rink due to the amount of use and the amount of residents the riding rink is going to serve which is probably out of balance when you look at the number of kids who want to play field type sports. There is a shortage of this type of facilities in Los Altos, Palo Alto and Los Altos Hills. He felt this piece of land would be much better used by serving a much larger segment of the Town population. Another area of concern was if the Town maintains the riding rink, the amount of insurance coverage mentioned in the report is totally inadequate.

Wes Henderson, 12720 Canario Way, stated from 1991 to 1999, he was the field manager for volunteers for the Little League field. He has been pro Little League as well as being a member of the neighborhood. The Public Address system is an issue that had been prohibited for many years noting that perhaps five times a year is too many. He felt the PA system could be controlled by directing it away from housing or have speakers closer to the bleacher areas. Also, he felt that the fields to the north were very noisy areas. He suggested looking into using earth berms or a retaining wall on the freeway side of the property to reduce noise. He also felt the Town barn was in need of landscaping.

Commissioner Cottrell asked what was being done regarding the "key" issue. Mr. Forbis stated this has been addressed as a condition of approval #8 which prohibits users of the facilities from making any lock or key changes without prior request made to the Town. Mr. Forbis also addressed the insurance issue stating the insurance information attached to the report is out of date and has been updated to \$2,000,00 overall and a \$1,000,000 each occurrence.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Cottrell and seconded by Commissioner Kerns to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the requested Conditional Use Permit to operate parks and recreation facilities at 27500 Purissima Road.

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Vitu, Mordo, Kerns & Cottrell
NOES: None

This item will be scheduled for a City Council public hearing agenda.

- 3.3 LANDS OF SINDHU & BERTRAND AND LARGE HOUSE LLC., 27060 and 27040 Old Trace Lane (245-03-LLA); A request for a Lot Line Adjustment. (staff-Debbie Pedro)

Staff introduced this item by reviewing the staff report.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING.

Pradeep Sindhu, 27060 Old Trace Lane, applicant, stated they are requesting, in conjunction with his neighbor, a lot line adjustment of an equal area swap which makes their areas of land a bit more rational for both parties (joint application).

Sandy Humphries, Environmental Design Committee, asked if a re-vegetation plan along the fence line of the Sindhu and Cranston property line is being proposed and if it would be scheduled for a hearing.

The Planning Director explained that a property owner is claiming that landscaping was removed from their property by Mr. Sindhu's contractors. It was his understanding that the neighbors were working something out. The Town cannot mandate Mr. Sindhu to install landscaping on his neighbor's property. It was agreed that this was a separate issue. The Commission was reviewing the request for a lot line adjustment only.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Brief discussion ensued.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Vitu and seconded by Commissioner Cottrell to forward a recommendation of approval of the lot line adjustment to the City Council, subject to the applicant's submittal of a legal description and plat map for each of the parcels and recordation of the certificates of compliance, Lands of Sindu & Bertrand and Large House LLC., 27060 and 27040 Old Trace Lane.

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Kerns, Cottrell, Vitu & Mordo
NOES: None

This item will be scheduled for a City Council public hearing agenda.

- 3.4 LANDS OF FORS & SELOVER, 12401 Hilltop Drive (208-02-ZP-SD-VAR); A request for a Site Development Permit for a 9,549 square foot new residence (maximum height 26' 10 ½"), a 766 square foot secondary dwelling unit (maximum height 23' 10") and a 7,252 square foot tennis court, and a variance to allow the tennis court and pool house to encroach into front setback. (staff-Debbie Pedro)

Staff introduced this item by reviewing the staff report. The current access to the property is also the 30 foot easement along the east property line. The new access will be coming directly off of Hilltop Drive along the south property line. The property owners will be required to dedicate a 30 foot half width right-of-way along Hilltop Drive and because the right-of-way center line at this section of Hilltop Drive is not located at the center line of the physical road but rather along the front property line, the entire 30 foot right-of-way is taken from within the property. An additional 40 foot setback is then taken from the new property line. As a result, the required right-of-way dedication is taken from the current property line, as opposed to the center of the road. According to the applicants, the combination of the 30 foot right-of-way dedication and 40 foot front yard setback will burden the owners with an additional 15 feet of setback as measured from the center of Hilltop Drive. As a result, the applicants are requesting for a variance to allow portions of the tennis court and the pool house with the attached trellis and outdoor fireplace to encroach within the 40 foot front yard setback. She further discussed the purpose of the Town's right-of-way and setback requirements. The 15 foot encroachment into the setback will not affect future road widening or utility installation. The purpose of preserving an open road corridor will be served because as one drives down the stretch of Hilltop Drive, the nearest structure from this property will be 70 feet way from the center of the road. In conclusion, she noted the receipt of a letter from Mr. Schott (12330 Hilltop Drive) who previously opposed any

structures being allowed in the front setback. He has sent a follow-up letter now indicating he would not have an issue with the variance as long as the areas in the front setback are adequately landscaped.

Brief discussion ensued regarding this unusual circumstance as it relates to the right-of-way. Jim Abraham discussed the old road and a drainage swale which may have been the reason that the road is offset. The Planning Director mentioned only one similar situation (Sherlock Road).

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Lance Fors, 12401 Hilltop Drive, applicant, explained their rationale for the variance with the assistance of three dimensional slides. He discussed the following: length of ownership; preserving the three sycamore trees, making the focal point of the new structures; building four small modular units around the courtyard to preserve the three trees; minimal grading; keeping the rural flavor; inner courtyard; design impact on their neighbors (Gikis) addressed with the placement of the garage; and the low reflectivity value of the roofing material.

Jean McCown, 1717 Embarcadero Road, Palo Alto, project representative, discussed the variance, stating the corners of the tennis court and the pool house will be more than 70 feet from the center line of Hilltop Drive.

Tom Arnett, 12361 Hilltop Drive, questioned the following: (1) with the 1.86 acreage why the applicants could not just move the structure up the hill to avoid the need for variances; (2) why they are proposing a new driveway which bisects an area that is part of the natural drainage for the surrounding hills when there is already a driveway; (3) why they need to build a driveway at all and what they will do to fix the drainage that will now be blocked; and (4) why is the pool house sited in such a prominent place?

Carol Gottlieb, 24290 Summerhill Road, stated if the Commission grants this variance, they will be eventually be granting a variance to everyone who has a 30 foot setback along Hilltop Drive (setting a precedent) although she was more concerned with drainage. Drainage in this area is very poor. She explained that the Town built a culvert over to this property but did not fix any drainage ditch. All of the water flowing down Hilltop Drive comes under the culvert and floods this property and moves on to the Gikis property, then to another pipe to the Hogan property, then to a drainage pipe on her property. Since the pipes cannot hold the water, Hilltop Drive ends up flooding which creates an erosion problem on both the Hogan property and her property. She wanted to make sure that the drainage issues are addressed. Regarding the right-of-way, when they purchased their home they were told that Hilltop Drive was expected to become a major road through the Town so 30 feet was taken from all the properties on her side of the road up to Hilltop Drive. When I-280 went in, a four lane road was not needed. They all still have a 30 foot right-of-way.

Fiona Sander, 12830 Hilltop Drive, directly across the street from the proposed driveway, voiced full support of the project with the new structures built around the existing trees.

Sandy Humphries, Environmental Design Committee, discussed drainage, as the area has a history of water and drainage problems. Condition #13 was reviewed as it relates to drainage.

Joseph Digiovanni, 12380 Hilltop Drive, agreed with his wife's comments. He had discussed drainage with the applicants and felt what was being proposed will improve the property.

Mr. Fors was excited regarding improving the drainage. He discussed the position of the tennis court noting it was placed on the natural slope, minimizing the overall grading. Regarding the variance request, he felt this was a unique situation noting the closest end of the tennis court is 70 feet or more from the center line of the existing road.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Mordo did not have enough experience to know if they were setting a precedent as Carol Gottlieb discussed. It looks like a rare occurrence but it could be the whole street. He asked if it would be a bad thing to have everyone have the same thing. He asked if there was any way to correct the situation by rededicating the right-of-way where it should be. The Planning Director pointed out this would cause harm to the property owners on the other side of the road. Every property is unique and when you approve a variance you are not legally creating a precedent.

Commissioner Kerns felt the applicants have done a good job siting the house around the sycamore trees and with no opposition from the neighbors. He did not have a problem with setting a precedent if other people in similar situations along this street want to come in asking for a variance.

Commissioner Vitu agreed with Commissioner Kerns' comments voicing support of the project. She felt if they place the tennis court further back on the property, it would require grading and cutting into the hillside.

Commissioner Cottrell was uncomfortable with the application. It is a beautiful design, but using every foot of development area and still asking for a variance. He was not sure the plan could not be redesigned to eliminate the need for a variance. He was not in favor of the application.

Chairman Clow agreed with previous comments as the owners purchased the property they saw where the setback was located, buying the property with no expectations of building outside the setback. The ordinances regarding height and variances are very clear, making it easy to work with applicants. He liked the design of the home but he was against granting a variance

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Mordo and seconded by Commissioner Mordo to approve the Site Development Permit for a new residence, secondary dwelling unit, tennis court, pool and pool house, and variance to allow the tennis court and pool house in the front setback, Lands of Fors and Selover, 12401 Hilltop Drive, with the recommended conditions of approval and variance findings.

AYES: Commissioners Kerns, Vitu & Mordo
NOES: Chairman Clow & Commissioner Cottrell

This item is subject to a 23 day appeal period..

- 3.5 LANDS OF CHOU, 12951 Cortez Lane (45-04-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit modification to an approved 650 square foot addition, 626 square foot second unit, and a roof deck. (staff-Debbie Pedro)

Staff introduced this item by reviewing the staff report which included noting a few minor corrections to the report. The applicants are requesting to modify the site development permit for an addition and pool that was approved in September, 2003. Recently it came to the Town's attention that the new building under construction did not conform to the original approved plan, specifically the applicants have made changes to the height and design of the building without prior approval by the Planning or Building Departments. The applicant submitted a permit modification request for the as-built changes to the project as well as some additional modifications to the design. Staff reviewed the changes as stated on page 2 of the staff report. The Town has received a number of complaints from the adjacent neighbors regarding the additions view and privacy impacts. She provided photographs of the site from the Craig and Dunkel sites. Letters from residents regarding this application have been placed in the Commissioner's boxes for review. In conclusion, staff reviewed the three recommendations, as noted in the report.

Commissioner Kerns asked if there was anything in the ordinances regarding disallowing roof decks. The Planning Director indicated NO, but the Commission has the authority to reduce the height of structure from the maximum height of 27 feet.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Timothy Chou, 12951 Cortez Lane, applicant, reviewed the history of the project, stating last August they applied for a site development permit and notices were sent out to the 22 neighbors within the 500 foot radius. At the time of the hearing, no neighbors attended the meeting or voiced any concerns. Since they were within the Town guidelines, the plans were approved including the roof top deck. Unfortunately, five months later some of the neighbors have expressed some "buyers remorse" with a series of negative e-mails. Hopefully, the Commission has before them about 13 positive e-mails which might present a slightly different point of view. He reviewed the adjustments to the previously approved project which included a 300 square foot reduction in the overall roof deck size and on the southern elevation (eastern view) they lowered the original eaves from 8 foot eaves to 2 foot eaves, replaced with open trellis work and on the main floor, reduced the overall deck from 8 feet to 6 feet. He further discussed the six

trees planted on the western side ranging in height from 27 feet to 23 feet. He referred to the photo taken of the story poles with the orange netting three feet in height. The approved height was demonstrated as required. In conclusion, he stated that they have an approved floor plan; there are some minor modifications (7 to 11 inches in height), some modifications which all have to do with reduction of the overall scale and the addition of a slanted roof which makes a better architectural tie-in from the original plan. The story pole height was within six inches of the as-built structure. He requested an approval. He also asked for the deletion of conditions 6, 7 and 14.

Staff indicated that condition #14 should be deleted as the floor area being proposed will not exceed the maximum allowed so there is no reason for them to remove the shed. She further stated that they would not recommend any structures (i.e. umbrella) on the roof deck that would exceed the 27 foot height limit. Staff is recommending that no accessory structures are placed on the roof deck.

Sharon Smith, 14495 Miranda Road, had reviewed the application and voiced support of the project.

Bob Sumbs, 12970 Cortez Lane, stated that all the people who live on the cul-de-sac are the concerned ones, not the ones living on Miranda Road and elsewhere in Town. The problem is that the building sticks out like a box car, asking why it has to be there. It also sits above the tree line and as viewed from Altamont Road. He was looking forward to reviewing the drainage plan as the dirt will run through his property. For clarification, it was noted that he sees the Chou house everyday driving to his house but he cannot see the house from his house.

Jim Lai, 12120 Foothill Lane, voiced support of the project which meets the Town's MDA/MFA, and height restrictions. The Chou's have also tried to accommodate some of the objections of the neighbors by adding trees and adding a sloping roof. Regarding the boxy structure, the house was not built by the Chou's but something they bought. The addition was designed to fit in with the existing structure.

Sandy Humphries, Environmental Design Committee, discussed the view from the roof deck to the Dunckel's house which looks directly down into their family swimming pool area. The trees planted by the Chou's do not mitigate that area. Roof decks are very difficult for neighbors.

Donna Dunckel, 12971 Cortez Lane, asked for clarification of the roof deck size reduction which was answered by staff. She did not know what was the actual project size. She felt the project keeps changing. They were not at the first meeting because Mr. Chou stated the project would be an in-law apartment over a basement. When the story poles went up, it still did not seem bad. The story poles only went up to the roof ridge, not the highest point. She felt privacy was the main issue. They are disappointed that this all has occurred but they remain focused on retrieving the privacy they have lost. Although this construction is within the code height limits, the Planning Commission can reduce the height of the proposed structure. Because the Chou property is located on a ridgeline and is located on the edge of an open space preserve, it would seem that it is the Planning Commission's responsibility to insure that Article 7 be implemented to require the building to be unobtrusive when viewed from off site. Only the Commissioners

are empowered to insure that the intent and spirit of the codes be carried out. The codes were created with a communal vision in mind to preserve scenic views and natural landscape and to protect the quality of life for each of the Los Altos Hills residents. She asked the Commission to deny the use of the deck and require the stairs and rail be dismantled. This would reduce the structures impact on the surrounding environment as well as returning their former privacy.

Marilyn Byers, 12997 Cortez Lane, felt the project was tainted from the beginning with inaccurate plans, inaccurate elevations, inaccurate story poles and poor communication. Moving mature trees (one to the side of the property to help the Duncckels) created other problems. She provided photos of the structure which is visible from many areas. She felt the proposed addition structure is in violation of Town's goals for the preservation of ridgelines and hilltops. They respectfully propose that the Commission cap the height of the structure at the existing white horizontal trim piece above the trellis on the east side of the addition which faces the Craig's home and the south side of the addition which faces Byrne Park. They also propose that the request for a roof deck, deck railing and staircase to the deck area and the north facing angled skylight be denied for the very reason that they are visible in a very negative way.

Nick Duncckel, 12971 Cortez Lane, stated, also present was Linda Craig, who prefers not to speak but agrees with his concerns. He stated that the deck is a severe invasion of their privacy. It is an observation deck on the third floor which somehow is not covered by rules. It looks into their living areas, family room, patio, bedroom, lawn and it is very invasive. They had no idea this would be a roof observation deck. The initial notice did not indicate an observation deck. There has been so many changes on the plans that they could not track them. There seems to be a disregard for the Town's process. The existence of the deck is their main concern. Planting trees is an insufficient mitigation. The skylight that goes under the solar roof will emit light into their house as well as the neighbor's house. He provided a photograph of the Chou's house. If all the neighbors were permitted to build a roof top deck that is not included in their floor plan, it would be a terrible precedent, spoiling Byrne Park. To support their position, he referred to Town Codes, Sections 10-2.702b1 and 10-2.701. He indicated that there was no reason that the solar panel could not go on the very large main roof of the house. They felt that they have been misled regarding this project. He felt it was reasonable to disallow the use of the third floor as a deck by requiring the existing railings and stairs be removed and to request that the solar panels be moved to the main house.

Mr. Chou provided photos of the solar panels of the Duncckels. In summary, he stated that they have an approved floor plan. They went through the process. The plans were approved. Their modifications are minor, requesting an approval.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Mordo discussed the impact on the neighbors. However, there is a process and a hearing and the neighbors did not attend the meeting, for whatever reason. The house was approved with the roof top deck. The requested modifications are minimal. He felt there was no reason to deny the request with the deletion of condition #2. He did not agreed with condition #7, wondering why they would not be allowed to have a table and chairs. Commissioner Kerns agrees. The Chou's have done a tremendous amount of work trying to accommodate the

neighbor's concerns. He felt the house was actually consistent with other houses in the neighborhood. He supports the project. Commissioner Vitu agreed with previous comments. It is always disappointing when this kind of neighborhood conflict arises and she understands the privacy concerns especially for the Duncels. She did not feel the as-built structure differs substantially from what was originally approved, noting reductions in some areas. She also noted that the structure is 3 feet below the maximum height limits. Regarding compatibility with other homes, she noted that the Duncel home is at the same height as the new construction of the Chou property. When the landscape screening plan comes in, there may be some additional landscape mitigation. She supports the conditions as noted by Mordo and Kerns. Commissioner Cottrell almost agreed with previous comments. However, he felt the roof deck was in violation of the Duncel's privacy. He liked everything else about the project except for the roof deck. The landscape plan will take care of the other neighbors in terms of their view. Particular attention should be paid to the drainage plan. He could support the project without the roof deck. Chairman Clow felt what was important was that there was an approval. What was built is very close to what was approved. There is an issue regarding the story poles not showing the top of the railing versus the top of the roof. In the future, if there is a rooftop deck being proposed, the story poles should go to the top of the railing. The project was previously approved and the modifications are very close to the original approval.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Mordo and seconded by Commissioner Vitu to approved the request for a Site Development Permit modification to an approved 650 square foot addition, 626 square foot second unit, and a roof deck, Lands of Chou, 12951 Cortez Lane, with the recommended conditions of approval, deleting conditions #2, 7 and 14, Lands of Chou, 12951 Cortez Lane.

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Mordo, Vitu & Kerns
NOES: Commissioner Cottrell

This approval is subject to a 23 day appeal period.

Brief break at 9:05

- 3.6 LANDS OF LOS ALTOS SCHOOL DISTRICT (Applicant: Town of Los Altos Hills), 25690 Fremont Road (56-04-SD-CUP); A request for a Conditional Use Permit for temporary Town offices located at the former Bullis/Purissima Elementary School at 25690 Fremont Road, for approximately 15 months, during the construction of a new Town Hall. (staff-Carl Cahill)

The Planning Director introduced this item by reviewing the staff report.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING
CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Cottrell and seconded by Commissioner Kerns to recommend that the City Council approve the conditional use permit for the temporary establishment of Town Facilities at the former Bullis-Purissima Elementary School site on 25890 Fremont Road, subject to the findings and conditions of approval, Lands of Los Altos School District (applicant: Town of Los Altos Hills).

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Mordo, Kerns, Vitu & Cottrell
NOES: None

This item will be scheduled for a City Council public hearing agenda.

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 Report from subcommittees-none

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Change the starting time for the Planning Commission meetings from 7:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. Discussion ensued regarding work and family schedules.

PASSED BY CONSENSUS: To leave the starting time for the Planning Commission meetings at 7:00 p.m.

6. REPORT FROM THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING

6.1 Planning Commission Representative for April 1st -Commissioner Vitu, reported on the following: the proposed ordinance amendments to the Town's zoning Code with regard FENCES (SECTION 10-1.504 (d) HEIGHT; Walls and fences).

6.2 Planning Commission Representative for April 15th -Commissioner Clow

6.3 Planning Commission Representative for May 6th -Commissioner Cottrell

6.4 Planning Commission Representative for May 20th -Commissioner Kerns

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7.1 Approval of March 11, 2004 minutes

PASSED BY CONSENSUS: To approve the March 11, 2004 minutes

7.2 Approval of March 25, 2004 minutes

PASSED BY CONSENSUS: To approve the March 25, 2004 minutes

8. REPORT FROM FAST TRACK MEETING-APRIL 6, 2004

- 8.1 LANDS OF BUXTON, 27850 Via Feliz (250-03-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a 6,489 square foot new residence (maximum height 24 feet) and remodel. Approved with conditions.

9. REPORT FROM SITE DEVELOPMENT MEETING-APRIL 6, 2004

- 9.1 LANDS OF BRANDMAN, 27686 Natoma Road (249-03-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a landscape screening plan. Approved with conditions.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 9:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lani Smith
Planning Secretary